arXiv:1611.10009v1 [cond-mat.str-el] 30 Nov 2016

Cooperative Phenomena in Spin Crossover Systems

Alexander I. Nesterov*
CUCEI, Universidad de Guadalajara, Guadalajara, CP 44420, Jalisco, México

Yuri S. Orlov** and Sergey G. Ovchinnikov***
L.V. Kirensky Institute of Physics, SB RAS, 660036, Krasnoyarsk, Russia and Siberian Federal University, 660041, Krasnoyarsk, Russia

Sergey V. Nikolaev****
Siberian Federal University, 660041, Krasnoyarsk, Russia

(Dated: 1 de diciembre de 2016)

Within the framework of a realistic multi-band $p-d$-model, we derived an effective Hamiltonian to describe the exchange interaction effects near the spin crossover in magnetic Mott-Hubbard insulators under pressure. It is shown that single-ion mechanism of spin crossover under change of the crystal field does not lead to a thermodynamic phase transition, however, at $T = 0$ a quantum phase transition appears. It has been found that the cooperativity leads to a modification of the quantum phase transition to a first-order phase transition and the appearance of metastable states of the system. The pressure - temperature phase diagram has been obtained to describe the magnetization and high-spin population near the spin crossover of the Mott's dielectrics with d^6-ions.

PACS numbers: Add PACS numbers
Keywords: Spin crossover, quantum phase transitions,

I. INTRODUCTION

The spin crossover (SCO) was discovered by Combi almost 80 years ago[1], but so far it attracts the attention of researchers. Primerely, the interest to SCO- systems is connected with the hope to design the free-inertial molecular two-state switches which can be used to store and process information in fast computational devices. Development of nano-technology prompts the study of this phenomenon in order to use certain properties of the SCO in the quantum transport and creation of a new generation of sensors and displays[2].

The SCO phenomenon is associated with the energy level crossing of the two different spin multiplets of magnetic ion under changing of some external parameters, i.e. temperature, composition, pressure, irradiation light, etc. Due to its cooperative nature, the SCO connects the micro- and macroscopic properties of the system. It is sometimes referred to SCO as a phase transition of a special type - the so-called supercritical transitions[3]. A nice example of a supercritical transition is spin transition in ferropericlase at high pressure, that probably takes place in the Earth's mantle[4–7].

Transition metal (TM) complexes embedded in a matrix of polymeric gels are widely used in medicine, catalysis, in nonlinear optics, photochromic and photorefractive systems, water purification, for creation of materials with nano-scale functionality, and in other areas. Recently these materials have attracted attention, since interaction of metals with polymeric gels results in unusual properties of hybrid organic-metal materials .

The external hydrostatic pressure, being applied to the SCO- materials, modifies the properties of the crystal lattice and reveals the role of the elastic fields in the cooperative interaction of the SCO- complexes. The pressure changes the volume characteristics of complex molecules, in particular, the distance between the central ion and ligand atoms. Thus, it affects the strength of the crystal field.

In order to obtain materials for possible use in mass storage devices or color displays one-, two- and three-dimensional SCO- compunds were synthesized. Study of the pressure efffect in these compounds sheds light on the role of within and interchain interactions, interplanar and volume interactions in the characteristics of these materials.

Intensive theoretical studies are devoted to the development of various models of the spin transition by considering different schemes that relate cooperativity of the transition in a separate complex with a transition in a medium containing a macroscopic number of complexes.

To date, the effect of pressure and temperature on the spin transition was described in terms of various approaches and approximations. One of the more common approaches is based on the Landau theory of phase transitions[8]. The se-

cond successful approach is based on the Ising model[2,9–33]. A third approach is the microscopic one[34]. Each of these approaches has its advantages and disadvantages (For discussion see Refs.[35,36]).

In the last decade, in this area a lot of works based on the theory of electron density potential has been appeared. In particular, frequency-power characteristics of the vibrational modes in the first coordination sphere was obtained for specific compounds. By applying the theory electron density potential and molecular dynamics, the SCO properties and identified areas of the existence of different phases have been obtained for $[Fe(PM-BIA)_2(NCS)_2]$ compound[37]. To our best knowledge, this is the first study in which a phase diagram of the SCO- compounds has been obtained. There have also been proposed and studied by methods of molecular dynamics[38,39] and Monte Carlo[40,41] various models in which the elastic constant depends on the distance between the structural elements.

Along with the use of static pressure for the study of spin transitions, in the literature there are also studies on the effect of impact pressure on the spin state of coordination complexes, such as $[Fe(phen)_2(NCS)2]$[42]. It was shown that a relatively low pressure pulse of 0.02 GPa is capable to induce an almost complete conversion of the spin on the hysteresis branches. Such effects may be applied to a spin state switching devices by using SCO- materials. Cooperative effects in such systems lead to different hysteresis phenomena and play an important role in the practical applications and understanding of their nature.

One can single out several essential types of interaction between metal ions, namely, electron-phonon, quadrupole and exchange interaction. Since, the direct overlap of d-orbitals of neighboring ions in the TMs is small, the main mechanism of the exchange interaction in these compounds is the Kramers-Anderson indirect exchange (or, as it is often called superexchange).

Cooperativeness in magnetic dielectrics is usually caused by interatomic exchange interaction. However, this mechanism does not work in SCO- systems with the ground state being low-spin (LS) singlet ion level. Generally, the magnetic cations of organometallic complexes are connected to each other by chemical bridges, and cooperative effects are realized through elastic interaction. In the literature, we found a few works that discuss cooperative magnetic nature through the exchange interaction between the excited high-spin (HS) states (see., i.e.,[43,44]). In all these works the form of the exchange interaction is postulated phenomenologically, as Heisenberg exchange interaction with empirical parameters.

Spin system with crossover include extensive class of materials: organometallic complexes, organic radicals, inorganic salts and transition metal oxides. In all these compounds, along with elastic interaction, the exchange interaction plays an important role in the formation of cooperativeness[43,44]. The most common and versatile approach to the SCO problem is based on the effective Hamiltonian. Within this approach, all these materials are treating from a single point of view. However, when two different spin multiplets are close, effective interaction between the magnetic cations may be far from the Heisenberg interaction, and the effective Hamiltonian should be obtained from a microscopic approach.

The present work is devoted to a neat derivation of the effective Hamiltonian for TM-oxides with SCO and study influence of arising cooperative effects on formation of the physical features of these materials, as well. Within the framework of the effective Hamiltonian approach, we study effect of the exchange interaction on the SCO.

In our approach, the orbital HS- and LS-states of the TM- ion are described in terms of one-half pseudospin. To obtain all parameters of the effective Hamiltonian, we applied (LDA + GTB)- method[45]. The use of projection operators Hubbard, as part of the (LDA + GTB)- method, yielded a number of new terms, previously not considered. They are responsible for the exciton type interaction. This opens up interesting possibilities for further research both equilibrium and nonequilibrium phenomena in the SCO- systems, for instance, interaction with radiation.

The paper is organized as follows. In Sec. 2 we derive the effective Hamiltonian for the multi-band model of strongly correlated TM-oxides. In Sec. 3 the SCO phenomena is studied in the mean field approximation. In Sec. 4 the results of numerical simulations are presented. In Conclusion we discuss the obtained results.

II. EFFECTIVE HAMILTONIAN APPROACH TO THE SPIN CROSSOVER IN MAGNETIC DIELECTRICS

For the TM- compounds with the predominant type of ionic bond (i.e. oxides, halides,

etc.), strong electron correlations determine the dielectric and magnetic properties. The commonly accepted minimal model for description of such compounds is a multi-band $p-d$-model. This model explicitly takes into account the Coulomb interaction of d- electrons of the TM-ion. The Hamiltonian of the model can be written as

$$\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_d + \mathcal{H}_p + \mathcal{H}_{pd}. \quad (1)$$

Here the first term, $\mathcal{H}_d = \sum_{i,\lambda,\sigma} \varepsilon_p^{\lambda} d^{\dagger}_{i,\lambda,\sigma} d_{i,\lambda,\sigma} + \mathcal{H}_d^{Coulomb}$, describes the d-electrons in the crystal field: ($\lambda = xy, yz, zx, x^2-y^2, z^2$) and their Coulomb interaction. The second term, $H_p = \sum\limits_{j,\alpha,\sigma} \varepsilon_p^{\alpha} p^{+}_{j\alpha\sigma} p_{j\alpha\sigma} + \sum\limits_{\langle j,j'\rangle} \sum\limits_{\alpha,\beta,\sigma} t_{pp}^{\alpha\beta} \left(p^{+}_{j\alpha\sigma} p_{j'\beta\sigma} + h.c. \right)$, with the hopping integral being $t_{pp}^{\alpha\beta}$, describes p-electrons of oxygen or other ligands involved in σ- and π-coupling ($\alpha, \beta = x, y, z$). The third term, $\mathcal{H}_{pd} = \sum_{\langle i,j\rangle,\sigma} (t_{pd}^{\lambda\alpha} d^{\dagger}_{i\lambda\sigma} p_{j\alpha\sigma} + h.c)$, characterizes the hybridization of the cation-anion states.

In this approach the Coulomb energy of p-electrons is usually neglected. However, if necessary, it can be easily taken into account within the framework of our (LDA + GTB)- approach (see below). Multi-band $p-d$-model, with all Coulomb interactions: $d-d$, $p-p$, and $p-d$ being included, was discussed in[46]

An important advantage of this multi-orbital model is the ability to form different many-electron states (terms) of the transition metal's ion. These terms are characterized by different values of the spin, $0 \le S \le 5/2$, and the orbital angular momentum. For d^n-ion in the crystal field, the ground state depends on the relationship between the Hund exchange constant, J_H , and crystal field, $10Dq$.

In some cases, the amount of cation-anion hybridization makes its contribution[47]. The magnitude of the crystal field depends on the interatomic distance and it is changed when the external pressure or "chemical pressure" is applied. The chemical pressure appears when isovalent substitution occurs in a series of solid solutions or stretching. For ionic crystals energy terms of d^n- electron configurations in a cubic crystal field have been obtained numerically. The results are presented by the so-called Tanabe-Sugano diagrams[48].

In the framework of the (LDA + GTB)-approach, parameters of the Hamiltonian (1) are obtained from the first principles. In order to adequately account electron correlations, the cluster approach of generalized tight-binding method is applied (GTB)[46].

In the GTB approach the crystal lattice is divided into clusters ("elementary cells"), and the total Hamiltonian is presented by $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_c + \mathcal{H}_{cc}$, where $\mathcal{H}_c = \sum_p \mathcal{H}_p$ is related to the contribution of all noninteracting clusters, and $\mathcal{H}_{cc}$ describes hopping and interaction between clusters.

The Hamiltonian, $\mathcal{H}_p$, can be diagonalized exactly, and we denote by $|p\rangle$ its eigenstates with the energy E_p. Next step is to introduce the Hubbard X-operators. They are defined as follows: $X_f^{pq} = |p\rangle\langle q|$. Algebra of X-operators is determined by the multiplying rule, $X_f^{pq} X_g^{rs} = \delta_{fg}\delta_{qr} X_f^{ps}$, and the completeness condition, $\sum X_f^{pp} = 1$. The indices p and q, being collective indices, contain a set of the following quantum numbers, characterizing the state of the system: the number of electrons n_p per unit cell, an irreducible representation Γ , that describes the transformation of the orbital part of the wave function under action of the point symmetry group of the given crystal, the magnitude of the spin, S, and its projection, m_S. Thus, one can write, $|p\rangle = |n_p; \Gamma; m_\Gamma; S; m_S\rangle$.

It is assumed that for the neighbor cells the eigenstates are orthogonal. If not, for instance, as in the case when two adjacent clusters share a common oxygen, one needs to use the orthogonalization procedure, employing the Wannier functions instead of the group of oxygen orbitals. For the first time such a procedure has been proposed for the three-band $p-d$-model in[49] and generalized to a multi-band model in[50].

Since the Hubbard operators form a linearly independent basis, any local operator can be expressed as a linear combination of X-operators. For instance, a single-electron annihilation operator, $a_{f\nu\sigma}$, in a f-cell with the band index ν, can be written as, $a_{f\nu\sigma} = \sum_{pq} |p\rangle\langle p|a_{f\nu\sigma}|q\rangle\langle q| = \sum_{pq} \gamma_{\nu\sigma pq} X_f^{pq}$. In the X-operators representation the Hamiltonian (1) takes the form,

$$\mathcal{H} = \sum_{f,p} (E_p - \mu n_p) X_f^{pq} + \sum_{f\neq g} \sum_{mn} t_{fg}^{mn} X_f^{\dagger m} X_g^{n}, \quad (2)$$

where μ is the chemical potential and $t_{fg}^{mn} = \sum_{\sigma\nu\nu'} T_{fg}^{\nu\nu'} \gamma^{*}_{\nu\sigma}(m) \gamma_{\nu'\sigma}(n)$. Here $T_{fg}^{\nu\nu'}$ are the hopping matrix elements in the basis of the orthogonalized Wannier functions. The SCO occurs in the case of the energy level crossing of

the two different spin states under the influence of external factors.

In what follows, we generalize the method of projection operators, developed for the Hubbard model[51], to obtain the effective Hamiltonian from (2), by excluding the interband hopping integral through the dielectric gap. We define the projection operator P_1 as,

$$P_1 = \sum_p (X_i^{pp} + X_j^{pp}) + \sum_{p.p'} X_i^{pp} X_j^{p'p'}. \quad (3)$$

In the r.h.s. of the Eq. (3) only those states $|p\rangle$ and $|p'\rangle$ are taken into consideration, for which the number of electrons per unit cell, n_p, is more (or less) than it follows from the electrical neutrality condition. As one can see, the operators P_1 and $P_2 = 1 - P_1$ satisfy the following identity: $P_a P_b = \delta_{ab} P_a$, where $a, b = 1, 2$.

Let us consider the auxiliar Hamiltonian, $\mathcal{H}_\eta = \mathcal{H}' + \mathcal{H}''$, where $\mathcal{H}' = P_1\mathcal{H}P_1 + P_2\mathcal{H}P_2$ and $\mathcal{H}'' = P_1\mathcal{H}P_2 + P_2\mathcal{H}P_1$, with η being a formal parameter. At the end of computation we set $\eta = 1$. Using the identity $\mathcal{H} = \sum_{a,b} P_a \mathcal{H} P_b$, one can show that $\mathcal{H}_\eta|_{\eta=1} = \mathcal{H}$.

We employ the method of operator perturbation theory to eliminate the processes with the interband hopping. The essence of the operator perturbation theory is that, using a canonical transformation, $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_\eta = \exp(-i\eta U)\mathcal{H}_\eta \exp(i\eta U)$, one can choose the operator U so that the linear in η terms of the Hamiltonian, $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_\eta$, i. e. those members who are responsible for the interband hopping, vanish. As one can show, this condition leads to the following equation for the operator U:

$$\mathcal{H}'' + [\mathcal{H}', U] = 0. \quad (4)$$

One can see that the condition $\tilde{\mathcal{H}} = \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_\eta|_{\eta=1}$ can be recast as,

$$\tilde{\mathcal{H}} = \mathcal{H}' + \frac{i}{2}[\mathcal{H}'', U]. \quad (5)$$

Using the results obtained in [42], we obtain

$$\tilde{\mathcal{H}} = P_1\mathcal{H}P_1 + P_2\mathcal{H}P_2 - \frac{1}{E_{ct}}[P_1\mathcal{H}P_2, P_2\mathcal{H}P_1], \quad (6)$$

where $E_{ct} = \langle P_2 H P_2\rangle - \langle P_1 H P_1\rangle$ is the energy of the charge transfer.

Gathering all results together, one can show that the effective Hamiltonian in the representation of spin operators, $\mathbf{S}_i$, and pseudospin operators, $\boldsymbol{\tau}_i$, becomes

$$\mathcal{H}_{eff} = J \sum_{a=1,2} \sum_{\langle i,j\rangle} \big(\mathbf{S}_i^a \cdot \mathbf{S}_i^a - \frac{\xi}{4} n_i^a n_j^a\big) p_i^a p_j^a + \big(f(P) - \varepsilon_0\big) \sum_i \tau_i^z + \mathcal{H}_{ex} \quad (7)$$

Here, the first term describes the exchange contribution to the Heisenberg Hamiltonian, n_i^a stand for operators of the particles on the i-node, the parameter $\xi = 1, -3$ corresponds to the antiferromagnetic and ferromagnetic ordering, respectively, and $p_i^a = (1/2)(1 + \lambda_a \tau_i^z)$ are the projection operators defined in the subspace of eigenstates of the projection pseudospin operator, $\tau_i^z|\alpha\rangle = \lambda_\alpha|\alpha\rangle$, with the eigenvalues being $\lambda_1 = 1$ and $\lambda_2 = -1$. The index α takes the value 1 for the HS- state and 2 for the LS- state of the system. The second term in Eq.(7) describes variation in the relative energy of electronic configurations for LS- and HS- states under the influence of the applied pressure P. In Eq. (7) we set $\varepsilon_0 = \Delta_s/2$, where $\Delta_s = E_{HS} - E_{LS}$ is the energy gap between the LS- and HS- states at zero pressure.

The third term in Eq. (7) includes the interaction of the exciton type. The most simple form it takes for two-level system. In this case orbital and spin singlet, $|S\rangle$, stand for the LS-state, and the HS- state is described by spin triplet, $|\sigma\rangle$, with the spin projections being, $\sigma = 0, \pm 1$. Thus, $\mathcal{H}_{ex}$ can be written as,

$$\mathcal{H}_{ex} = J_{ex} \sum_\sigma \sum_{\langle i,j\rangle} \Big(\tau_i^+ \tau_j^- X_i^{\sigma,S} X_j^{S,\sigma} + \tau_i^- \tau_j^+ X_i^{S,\sigma} X_j^{\sigma,S} - (-1)^\sigma (\tau_i^+ \tau_j^+ X_i^{\sigma,S} X_j^{\sigma,S} + \tau_i^- \tau_j^- X_i^{S,\sigma} X_j^{S,\sigma})\Big) \quad (8)$$

where on the i-site the Hubbard operators $X_i^{\sigma,S}$ and $X_i^{S,\sigma}$ describe the transitions in the spin subspace of the system from the singlet state to the triplet state with the projection of the spin σ, and vice versa. The operators τ_i^+ and

τ_i^- have the same meaning for the orbital part of the wave functions.

Note that the interaction between the spin and orbital degrees of freedom has long been studied in the literature in the Kugel-Khomskii model[52]. Our Hamiltonian contains formally similar combination of the pseudospin spin and operators, but the physical origin of there is different from the analogues in the Kugel-Khomskii model.

The Hamiltonian (7) can be generalized by including the phonon interaction between TM-ions and spin-orbit interaction. The phonon contribution is described by [43],

$$\mathcal{H}_{e-ph} = J_1 \sum_{\langle i,j\rangle} \tau_i^x \tau_j^x + J_3 \sum_{\langle i,j\rangle} \tau_i^z \tau_j^z \qquad (9)$$

where the coupling constants J_1 and J_3 are determined by the interaction of different phonon modes of the lattice. The spin-orbit interaction in the highest order of the perturbation theory leads to the mixture of the the LS- and HS- states caused by tunneling of the system through a potential barrier between the LS- and HS-states. The corresponding Hamiltonian can be written as[53],

$$\mathcal{H}_{so+tunneling} = J_x \sum_i \tau_i^x. \qquad (10)$$

In recent years the unusual properties of supramolecules, containing spin-active coordinated TM- ions of the iron group, have increasingly drawn the attention of researchers. These systems exhibit induce both, the thermal SCO and the SCO arising under the impact of pressure, or as a result of the light irradiation of the sample (LIESST-effect) The LIESST spin transition, HS →LS, being induced by the interaction of the vibronic levels of different multiplicity, is often accompanied by hysteresis[54].

Irradiation of frozen $[Fe(ptz)_6](BF4)_2$ sample at a wavelength of 514 nm results in spin-allowed transitions ${}^1A_1 \to {}^1T_1$. The excited state would relax back to the initial singlet state, unless the spin-orbit interaction had provided intersystem transitions in the triplet states, ${}^3T_2$ and ${}^3T_1$. These states overlap with the quintet, ${}^5E$, which then relaxes into a metastable state ${}^5T_2$. The latter can exist indefinitely at low temperatures, since the potential barrier separates it from the ground state ${}^1A_1$. To reverse LIESST, the low-lying state ${}^3T_1$ should exist. This state is an intermediate in the two intersystem crossing and can decay into ${}^5T_2$ and ${}^1A_1$. Therefore, by irradiating such a state at a closest infrared wavelength transition: ${}^5T_2 \to {}^5E$ ((752,7 nm) for $[Fe(ptz)_6](BF4)_2$)), the reverse transition in singlet ${}^1A_1$ can be carried out in .

The terms $\mathcal{H}_{ex}$ and $\mathcal{H}_{e-ph}$ (see Eqs. (8) and (10)) are directly related to the LIESST-effect and can be used for description and simulation of the SCO in supramolecule systems.

III. MEAN FIELD APPROXIMATION

In compounds with SCO, the state of the system is defined by spin and orbital quantum numbers. As it follows from Eq. (7) the exchange interaction has a kinematic origin and the spin-orbit interaction is non-relativistic. In what follows we only consider these interactions, writing the effective Hamiltonian as,

$$\mathcal{H}_{eff}^{s\tau} = J \sum_{\alpha=1,2} \sum_{\langle i,j\rangle} \mathbf{S}_i^\alpha \cdot \mathbf{S}_j^\alpha \Big(1 + \lambda_\alpha \tau_i^z + \lambda_\alpha \tau_j^z + \tau_i^z \tau_j^z\Big) + \big(f(P) - \varepsilon_0\big) \sum_i \tau_i^z. \qquad (11)$$

In the mean field approximation the pseudospins are independent of each other, and, therefore $\langle \tau_i^z \tau_j^z \rangle = \langle \tau_i^z \rangle \langle \tau_j^z \rangle$ and $\langle \tau_i^z \rangle = \langle \tau^z \rangle$. Using these results, we obtain

$$H_s = \sum_{\alpha=1,2} \sum_{\langle i,j\rangle} J_S^\alpha \mathbf{S}_i^\alpha \cdot \mathbf{S}_j^\alpha. \qquad (12)$$

Here $J_S^\alpha = 4Jn_\alpha^2$ is the renormalized spin exchange constant, and $n_\alpha = (1/2)(1 + \lambda_\alpha \langle \tau^z \rangle)$ denotes the HS/LS fraction.

To calculate the thermodynamic average, $\langle \mathbf{S}_i^\alpha \rangle$, we apply now the mean field approximation in spin variables. Let $\mathbf{m}_i^\alpha$ be a unit vector, so that $\mathbf{S}_i^\alpha = S_\alpha \mathbf{m}_i^\alpha$. Further we assume $\mathbf{m}_i^\alpha = (0, 0, m_i^\alpha)$. Then, using the Hamiltonian (12), we obtain

$$m_\alpha = B_{S_\alpha}(\beta \nu_\alpha m_\alpha n_\alpha^2), \qquad (13)$$

where $m_\alpha \equiv \langle m_i^\alpha \rangle$, $\nu_\alpha = 4c|J|S_\alpha^2$, the coordination number being c, and

$$B_S(x) = \left(1+\frac{1}{2S}\right)\coth\left(\left(1+\frac{1}{2S}\right)x\right) - \frac{1}{2S}\coth\left(\frac{x}{2S}\right) \quad (14)$$

is the Brillouin function.

A. Effective pseudospin Hamiltonian

In order to eliminate the spin degrees of freedom and obtain the effective pseudospin Hamiltonian, we average the Hamiltonian (11) over spin variables, writing

$$\mathcal{H}_\tau = J\sum_{\alpha=1,2}\sum_{\langle i,j\rangle}\langle \mathbf{S}_i^\alpha \cdot \mathbf{S}_j^\alpha\rangle\left(1+\lambda_\alpha\tau_i^z+\lambda_\alpha\tau_j^z+\tau_i^z\tau_j^z\right)+\left(f(P)-\varepsilon_0\right)\sum_i\tau_i^z. \quad (15)$$

In the mean field approximation the spins are independent of each other. This implies $\langle \mathbf{S}_i^\alpha \cdot \mathbf{S}_j^\alpha\rangle = \langle \mathbf{S}_i^\alpha\rangle \cdot \langle \mathbf{S}_j^\alpha\rangle$. We replace $\mathbf{S}_i^\alpha$ and the number of particles operators by their averages: $\mathbf{S}_i^\alpha \to S_\alpha\langle \mathbf{m}_i^\alpha\rangle$ and $\hat{n}_i^\alpha \to \langle n_i^\alpha\rangle \equiv N_\alpha$.

Gathering all terms together, we obtain the total effective pseudospin Hamiltonian of the system as,

$$\mathcal{H}_\tau = \mathcal{H}_0 - \Delta(P)\sum_i\tau_i^z - \tilde{\Delta}\sum_{\langle i,j\rangle}\tau_i^z\tau_j^z, \quad (16)$$

where $\mathcal{H}_0 = -\sum_i(\Delta_1+\Delta_2)$, $\Delta_\alpha = 2J({S_\alpha}^2 m_\alpha^2 - N_\alpha^2/4)$, $\Delta(P) = \Delta_1-\Delta_2+\varepsilon_0-f(P)$ and $\tilde{\Delta} = (\Delta_1+\Delta_2)/2$. Further, it is convenient to introduce a new parameter q , writing $N_\alpha = qS_\alpha$.[60] Thus, the Hamiltonian,

$$\mathcal{H}_\tau = -\Delta(P)\sum_i\tau_i^z - \tilde{\Delta}\sum_{\langle i,j\rangle}\tau_i^z\tau_j^z \quad (17)$$

can be considered as the effective Hamiltonian to describe the SCO as pressure, temperature or both, are changed.

In the mean field approximation we obtain

$$\mathcal{H}_\tau^{MF} = -\Delta_{eff}(P)\sum_i\tau_i^z, \quad (18)$$

where $\Delta_{eff}(P) = \Delta_1-\Delta_2+\varepsilon_0-f(P)+c\tilde{\Delta}\langle\tau\rangle$, and we set $\langle\tau\rangle \equiv \langle\tau^z\rangle$.

The computation of thermodynamic average yields $\langle\tau\rangle = \tanh\left(\beta\Delta_{eff}+\ln g/2\right)$, where $\beta = 1/k_BT$, and $g = g_{HS}/g_{LS}$ denotes the ratio of the degeneracy of HS- and LS- states. The populations of HS- and LS- states are found to be

$$n_{HS} = n_1 = \frac{1+\tanh\left(\beta\Delta_{eff}(P)+\ln\sqrt{g}\right)}{2}, \quad (19)$$

$$n_{LS} = n_2 = \frac{1-\tanh\left(\beta\Delta_{eff}(P)+\ln\sqrt{g}\right)}{2}. \quad (20)$$

One can rewrite these equations as,

$$n_{HS} = \frac{1}{1+g\exp(-2\beta\Delta_{eff}(P))}, \quad (21)$$

$$n_{LS} = \frac{1}{1+g\exp(2\beta\Delta_{eff}(P))}. \quad (22)$$

IV. IMPACT OF COOPERATIVE EFFECTS ON THE SPIN CROSSOVER

We find that in the mean field approximation the SCO in the TM- compounds can be described by the effective Hamiltonian (18). The populations of HS- and LS- states are described by self-consistent system of the transcendental equations:

$$m_\alpha = B_{S_\alpha}(\beta\nu_\alpha m_\alpha n_\alpha^2), \quad (23)$$

$$n_1 = \frac{1+\tanh\left(\beta\Delta_{eff}(P)+\ln\sqrt{g}\right)}{2}, \quad (24)$$

$$n_2 = \frac{1-\tanh\left(\beta\Delta_{eff}(P)+\ln\sqrt{g}\right)}{2}. \quad (25)$$

where

$$\Delta_{eff} = 2J\left({S_1}^2\left(m_1^2+\frac{q^2}{4}\right)-{S_2}^2\left(m_2^2+\frac{q^2}{4}\right)\right) + cJ\langle\tau\rangle\left({S_1}^2\left(m_1^2+\frac{q^2}{4}\right)+{S_2}^2\left(m_2^2+\frac{q^2}{4}\right)\right) + \varepsilon_0 - f(P), \quad (26)$$

and $\langle\tau\rangle = \tanh\left(\beta\Delta_{eff} + \ln g/2\right)$. In what follows we restrict ourselves by consideration of the case $S_2 = 0$.

Let us denote $m = m_1$, $n = n_1$ and $S = S_1$. Then Eqs. (23) - (25) can be recast as,

$$m = B_S(\beta\nu m n^2), \tag{27}$$

$$n = \frac{1+\langle\tau\rangle}{2}, \tag{28}$$

$$\langle\tau\rangle = \tanh\left(\beta\Delta_{eff}(P) + \ln\sqrt{g}\right), \tag{29}$$

where

$$\Delta_{eff}(P) = \frac{\nu}{2c}\left(m^2 + \frac{q^2}{4}\right)\left(1 + \frac{c}{2}\langle\tau\rangle\right) + \varepsilon_0 - f(P). \tag{30}$$

Here we set $\nu = 4cJS^2$. One can recast this as $\nu = 3T_cS/(S+1)$, where $T_c = 4cJS(S+1)/3k_B$ is the Neel temperature at $P = 0$.

The critical pressure, P_c, corresponds to the energy level crossing of HS- and LS- states and satisfies the equation, $\varepsilon_0 - f(P_c) = 0$. Its magnitude is determined by intraionic Hund exchange. For PM ions in the cubic and tetragonal crystal field, the explicit magnitudes of P_c are obtained in[55–58]. Further we assume $f(P) = aP$, so that one can write $\varepsilon_0 = aP_c$.

Below, in our numerical simulations, the parameters are chosen as follows: $S = 2$, $c = 6$, $g = 15$, $J = 28\,\mathrm{K}$, $a = 80\,\mathrm{K/Gpa}$ and $P_c = 55\,\mathrm{Gpa}$. Using these parameters, we obtain $T_c = 1344\,\mathrm{K}$. The pressure is measured in units of P_c and the temperature in inits of T_c.

First we consider the behavior of the system described by Eqs. (27) - (29) in the absence of exchange interaction, $J = 0$. In this case the magnetization $m = 0$. The results of numerical simulations are presented in Fig. 1. At $T = 0$, one can observe a sharp jump in the population of the HS- state at the crossover point. In the thermodynamic limit this is related to the quantum phase transitions with the order parameter being the Berry phase[59]. With increasing of the temperature the quantum phase transition becomes a smooth phase transition.

Let us now consider the system of Eqs. (27) - (29) for $J \neq 0$.

In the limit of $T \to 0$, we succeeded to obtain the analytical solution given by the following multi-valued function (see blue crosses in Fig. 2a):

$$n = \begin{cases} 1, & 0 \le P \le P_1^{(m)} \\ f_m(P), & P_0^{(m)} < P < P_1^{(m)} \\ 0, & P \ge P_0^{(m)}, \end{cases} \tag{31}$$

where

$$f_m(P) = n_0 - \alpha_m(1 - P). \tag{32}$$

Here

$$\alpha_m = \frac{2aP_c}{cJS^2(4m^2 + q^2)}, \quad m = 0, 1, \tag{33}$$

and we set $n_0 = 1/2 - 1/c$. Employing Eq. (31), we obtain:

$$P_0^{(m)} = (1 - \alpha_m^{-1} n_0), \tag{34}$$

$$P_1^{(m)} = (1 + \alpha_m^{-1}(1 - n_0)). \tag{35}$$

The interval of pressure, $\Delta P^{(m)} = P_1^{(m)} - P_0^{(m)} = \alpha_m^{-1}$, corresponds to the region of critical behavior of a physical system in which hysteresis phenomena are significant. For the chosen parameters we find $\Delta P^{(0)} = 16{,}5\,\mathrm{GPa}$ and $\Delta P^{(1)} = 33\,\mathrm{GPa}$. Note that in the absence of cooperativity ($J = 0$) width of this domain is zero, $\Delta P^{(m)} = 0$.

In the limit of $T \to 0$ and $n \to 0$, similar consideration of the magnetization, besides trivial solutions $m = 0$ and $m = 1$, yields (see red circulus in Fig. 2a)

$$m = \sqrt{\alpha(1 - P/P_c) - q^2/4}, \tag{36}$$

where $\alpha = aP_c/(4JS^2)$ and

$$P_0 = P_c(1 - \alpha^{-1}(1 + q^2/4)), \tag{37}$$

$$P_1 = P_c(1 + \alpha^{-1} q^2/4). \tag{38}$$

At zero temperature the ground state of the system is defined by the minimum of its energy,

$$E = -N\Delta_{eff}(P)\langle\tau\rangle. \tag{39}$$

In the limit of zero temperature, one can recast this equation as,

$$E_m = -E_0(2n - 1)(1 + m^2)(n - f_m(P)), \tag{40}$$

where $E_0 = \nu N/2$.

Taking into account Eq. (31), one can show that at zero temperature the energy of the system is defined by piecewise function

$$E_m = \begin{cases} E_m^{HS}, & 0 \le P \le P_1^{(m)} \\ 0, & P_0^{(m)} < P < P_1^{(m)} \\ E_m^{LS}, & P \ge P_0^{(m)}, \end{cases} \tag{41}$$

where $E_m^{HS} = E_0(1+m^2)(f_m(P)-1)$ is the HS-state energy, and $E_m^{LS} = -E_0(1+m^2)f_m(P)$ is

the LS- state energy (see Fig. 2b). From here it follows that the energy gap, $\Delta E = E_1 - E_0$, between energies of the ordered and disordered states is

$$\Delta E = E_0 \begin{cases} n_0 - 1, & 0 \le P \le P_1^{(m)} \\ 0, & P_0^{(m)} < P < P_1^{(m)} \\ -n_0, & P \ge P_0^{(m)}. \end{cases} \quad (42)$$

Solutions in Fig. 2a that correspond to the minimum of the energy are connected by solid lines (the red line for the magnetization m, blue - for the population of the HS- state n_{HS}).

A. Numerical simulations

The computation of the Helmholtz free energy, $F = -k_B T \ln Z$, where Z denotes the partition function of the two-level system described by the effective Hamiltonian (18), yields

$$F = -N\beta^{-1} \ln(2\cosh\left(\beta\Delta_{eff}(P) + \ln\sqrt{g}\right). \quad (43)$$

In Fig. 3 $P-T$ phase diagrams of HS- state population n_{HS} (a) and magnetization m (b), corresponding to the minimum free energy F (43), are depicted. In Fig. 4 all the possible self-consistent solution of the system Eqs. (27) - (29) for the above set of parameters, marked with red circles for the magnetization m and blue crosses for the populations of HS-state n_{HS} for some specific values of external pressure (see. below) in units of P_C as function of temperature are depicted. The temperature T is specified in units of the kinematic exchange coupling constant J. Those solutions that correspond to the minimum of the free energy are connected by solid lines (the red line for the magnetization m, blue - for the population of the HS- state n_{HS}). The remaining solutions are metastable. From Fig. 2 and 3 it is clear that because of the co-operative exchange interaction J in the system the ground magnetically ordered state is maintained until $P_0 > P_C$ despite the fact that in the single-ion picture when $P > P_C$ the ground state is a non-magnetic LS- state. At $P > P_0$ the magnetic ground state is transform to a non-magnetic by the 1^{st}-order transition. Breaks of energy which are typical for the 1^{st}-order phase transitions are clear visible in Fig. 2b. In the range of pressure $P \le P_0$ (Fig. 3b, 4a and 4b) with increasing temperature the system undergoes a 2^{nd}-order phase transition in the paramagnetic state. On the $P-T$ diagrams of a physical system (Fig. 3) is well visible the existence of a singular point, the so-called tri-critical point (T^*, P^* in Fig. 3b), in which the 2^{nd}-order phase transition line initially continuously passes in line of the 1^{st}-order phase transitions, close to the 2^{nd} and then into a line of phase transitions of the 1^{st}-order (point T', P' in Fig. 3b). At $P_0 < P \le P'$ the ground state of the system is not magnetic, but with increasing temperature the magnetic HS- state populated, and in the system by the phase transition of the 1^{st}-order a long-range magnetic order is restored (Fig. 4c-f) as energetically more favorable. Thus, due to the cooperative interaction J in systems with spin crossover under pressure the reflexive magnetization may exist. With further increase in temperature the system goes into the paramagnetic state by a phase transition of the 2^{nd}-order if $P_0 < P \le P^*$ and of the 1^{st}-order close to the 2^{nd} if $P^* < P \le P'$. With increasing pressure at $P > P_C$ an energy interval between the ground non-magnetic LS- state and the nearest excited magnetic HS- state increased and when $P > P'$ (Fig. 4g and 4h), the thermal energy required for the HS- state population to the desired extent become comparable with the value of the exchange interaction J - magnetic order does not arise.

V. CONCLUSION

Cooperative effects in the SCO systems, where the role of the controlling parameter is carried out by external pressure, lead to an unusual modification of the system. The magnetic ordering can be suppressed by external pressure, and near of the quantum critical point a region of metastable states arise.

In the experiment the independent variables are the pressure and temperature. In this paper, analysis of the SCO system was carried out using the Helmholtz free energy. However, even in this limited approach, one can set the main properties of the model. The potential difference with the general case, that includes the possible change of the system volume, will be only quantitative. In order to take into account the latter, one should consider the Gibbs thermodynamic potential instead of the Helmholtz free energy. This work is in progress.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by RFBR and Government of Krasnoyarsk Territory according to the research project 16-42-243048, 16-42-240413, 16-42-240746, by the Council of the President of the Russian Federation for Support of Young Scientists and Leading Scientific Schools, project no. SP-1844.2016.1, NSh-7559.2016.2, Russian Foundation for Basic Research, project nos. 17-02-00826, 17-02-00052, 16-02-00507, 16-02-00098, 16-02-00273 A.I. Nesterov acknowledge the support from the CONACyT.

* Electronic address: nesterov@cencar.udg.mx
** Electronic address: jso.krasn@mail.ru
*** Electronic address: sgo@iph.krasn.ru
**** Electronic address:

[1] L. Cambi, and A. Cagnasso, Atti Accad. Lincei **13**, 809 (1931).
[2] Cătălin M. Jureschi, Jorge Linares, Aurelian Rotaru, Marie Hélène Ritti, Michel Parlier, Marinela M. Dîrtu, Mariusz Wolff and Yann Garcia, Sensors **15**, 2388 (2015).
[3] I.P. Bazarov, *Thermodynamics* (Pergamon Press, Oxford, 1964)
[4] J. Liu, J-F. Lin, Z. Mao and V. B. Prakapenka, American Mineralogist **99**, 84 (2014).
[5] Jin Liu, Jung-Fu Lin and Vitali B. Prakapenka, Scientific Reports **5**, 7640 (2015).
[6] J.F. Lin, G. Vanko, S.D. Jacobsen, V. Iota-Herbei, V.V. Struzhkin, V.B. Prakapenka, A. Kuznetsov, C.S. Yoo, Science **317**, 1740 (2007).
[7] Igor S. Lyubutin, Viktor V. Struzhkin *et al*, PNAS **110**, 7142 (2013).
[8] D. Chernyshov, H.-B. Burgi, M. Hostettler, K.W. Tornroos, Phys. Rev. B 70, 0941161 (2004).
[9] J. Wajnsflasz and R. Pick, J. Phys. Colloques, **32**, 1 (1971).
[10] Robert A. Bari and J. Sivardidre, Phys. Rev. B **B 5**, 4466 (1972).
[11] J. Linares, H. Spiering, F. Varret, Eur. Phys. J. **B 10**, 271 (1999).
[12] M.M. Dîrtu, Y. Garcia, M. Nica, A. Rotaru, J. Linares, F. Varret, Polyhedron, **26**, 2259 (2007).
[13] A. B. Koudryavtsev and W. Linert, J. Structural Chem. **50**, 1181 (2009)
[14] J. Wajnflasz, Phys. Status Solidi **40**, 537 (1970).
[15] A. Bousseksou, H. Constant-Machado, and F. Varret, J. Phys. I **5**, 747 (1995).
[16] M. Nishino, K. Boukheddaden, S. Miyashita, and F. Varret, Phys. Rev. B **68**, 224402 (2003).
[17] S. Miyashita, Y. Konishi, H. Tokoro, M. Nishino, K. Boukheddaden, and F. Varret, Prog. Theor. Phys. **114**, 719 (2005).
[18] Y. Konishi, H. Tokoro, M. Nishino, and S. Miyashita, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **75**, 114603 (2006).
[19] A. Dobrinescu, C. Enachescu, and A. Stancu, J. Magn. Magn. Mater. **321**, 4132 (2009).
[20] H. Banerjee, M. Kumar, and T. Saha-Dasgupta, Phys. Rev. B **90**, 174433 (2014).
[21] K. Boukheddaden, I. Shteto, B. Hôo, and F. Varret, Phys. Rev. B **62**, 14796 (2000).
[22] K. Boukheddaden, I. Shteto, B. ôo, and F. Varret, Phys. Rev. B **62**, 14806 (2000).
[23] F. Varret, S.A. Salunke, K. Boukheddaden, A. Bousseksou, E. Codjovi, C. Enachescu, and J. Linares, C. R. Chim. **6**, 385 (2003).
[24] M. Nishino, S. Miyashita, and K. Boukheddaden, J. Chem. Phys. **118**, 4594 (2003).
[25] K. Boukheddaden, J. Linares, E. Codjovi, F. Varret, V. Niel, and J.A. Real, J. Appl. Phys. **93**, 7103 (2003).
[26] K. Boukheddaden, J. Linares, R. Tanasa, and C. Chong, J. Phys.: Condens. Matter **19**, 106201 (2007).
[27] S. Mouri and K. Tanaka, Phys. Rev. B **78**, 174308 (2008).
[28] A. Atitoaie, R. Tanasa, C. Enachescu, J. Magn. Magn. Mater. **324**, 1596 (2012).
[29] D. Chiruta, J. Linares, P.R. Dahoo, and M. Dimian, Physica B **435**, 76 (2014).
[30] I. Gudyma and A. Maksymov, Phys. Rev. B **89**, 224412 (2014).
[31] I. Gudyma and A. Maksymov, Phys. Rev. E **90**, 052135 (2014).
[32] M. Paez-Espejo, M. Sy, F. Varret, and K. Boukheddaden, Phys. Rev. B **89**, 024306 (2014).
[33] W. Laosiritaworn and Y. Laosiritaworn, Polyhedron **66**, 108 (2013).
[34] T. Kambara, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **50**, 2257 (1981).
[35] V.V. Shelest, A.V. Hristov, G.G. Levchenko, FNT **42**, 644 (2016).
[36] G.G. Levchenko, A.V. Hristov, V.N. Varyuhin FNT **40**, 737 (2014).
[37] A. Marbeuf, S.F. Matar, P. Negrier, L. Kabalan, J.-F. Letard, and P. Guionneau, Chem. Phys. **420**, 25 (2013).
[38] M. Nishino, K. Boukheddaden, Y. Konishi, and S. Miyashita, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 247203 (2007).
[39] K. Boukheddaden, M. Nishino, and S. Miyashita, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 177206 (2008).
[40] Y. Konishi, H. Tokoro, M. Nishino, and S. Miyashita, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 067206 (2008).
[41] S. Miyashita, Y. Konishi, M. Nishino, H. Tokoro, and P.A. Rikvold, Phys. Rev. B **77**, 014105 (2008).
[42] A. Bousseksou, G. Molnar, J.-P.Tuchagues, N. Menendez, E. Codjovi, and F. Varret, C. R. Chimie **6**, 329 (2003).
[43] Hrishit Banerjee, Manoranjan Kumar, and Tanusri Saha-Dasgupta, Phys. Rev. B **90**, 174433

(2014).
[44] Carsten Timm and Charles J. Pye, Phys. Rev. B **77**, 214437 (2008).
[45] S.G. Ovchinnikov, V.A. Gavrichkov, M.M. Korshunov, E.I. Shneyder, LDA+GTB method for band structure calculations in the strongly correlated materials. In the "Theoretical Methods for strongly Correlated systems", Ed. A. Avella, F. Mancini, Springer Series in Solid-State Sciences.Volume 171, 143-171, Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, 2012.
[46] S.G. Ovchinnikov, Physics-Uspechi **40**, 993 (1997).
[47] S.G. Ovchinnikov, Yu.S. Orlov, JETPh **104**, 436 (2007).
[48] Y. Tanabe and S. Sugano, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **9**, 753 (1954).
[49] F.C. Zhang and T.M. Rice, Phys. Rev. B **37**, 3759 (1988).
[50] L.F. Feiner, J.H. Jefferson, and R. Raimondi, Phys. Rev. B **53**, 8751(I), 8774(II) (1996).
[51] K.A. Chao, J. Spalek, A.M. Oles, J. Phys. C: Sol. Stat. Phys. **10**, 271 (1977).
[52] K.I. Kugel', D.I. Khomskii, Sov. Phys. Usp. **25**, 231 (1982).
[53] Gabriele D' Avino and Anna Painelli, Phys. Rev. B **84**, 104119 (2011).
[54] Decurtins S., Guetlich P., Koehler C.P. et al. Chem. Phys. Lett. **105**, 1 (1984).
[55] S.G. Ovchinnikov, JETP **140**, 107 (2008).
[56] S.G. Ovchinnikov, J. Phys.: Condens. Matter **17**, 743 (2005).
[57] S.G. Ovchinnikov, JETP **116**, 123 (2013).
[58] K.A. Lobach, S. G. Ovchinnikov, and T.M. Ovchinnikova, JETP **120**, 132 (2015).
[59] A. I. Nesterov and S.G. Ovchinnikov, JETP Letters, **90**, 530 (2009).
[60] In what follows we assume $q = 2$. Obviously, this assumption is correct if the number of d-electrons is ≤ 5. For ions with more than half-filled shell parameter q should be revisited.



Figura 1: (Color online) HS-state population vs. pressure and temperature in absence of the kinematic exchange interaction ($J = 0$).



(a)



(b)

Figura 2: (Color online) (a) Analytical solutions (31), (36) and (b) the corresponding energy values (41). Couples of solutions for the magnetization (circles) and the population of the HS-state (crosses), for which the energy has the lowest value, are connected by a solid line.



(a)



(b)

Figura 3: (Color online) $P-T$ phase diagram of HS-state population (a) and magnetization (b), corresponding to the minimum of the free energy.



Figura 4: (Color online) Solutions of Eqs. (27) - (29) for different values of external pressure as function of temperature. Couples of solutions for the magnetization (circles) and the population of the HS-state (crosses), for which the thermodynamic potential has the lowest value, are connected by a solid line.